

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated February 12, 2008. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-15, 17-23, 25, 26, and 28-42 were pending in the Application. No claims are requested to be cancelled. No claims are currently being amended. No claims are being added. Claims 1-15, 17-23, 25, 26, and 28-42 are now pending in this Application.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the Application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the Application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

For simplicity and clarity purposes in responding to the Office Action, Applicants' remarks are primarily focused on the rejections of the independent claims (i.e., claims 1, 14, 15, 17, 18, 23, 28, 37, 41, and 42) outlined in the Office Action with the understanding that the dependent claims that depend from the independent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons (and in most cases other reasons) that the independent claims are patentable. Applicants expressly reserve the right to argue the patentability of the dependent claims separately in any future proceedings.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. Independent Claims 14, 15, 17, and 18

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 14, 15, 17, and 18 along with various dependent claims as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,421,593 titled "Military Vehicle Having Cooperative Control Network With Distributed I/O Interfacing" to Kempen et al. ("Kempen") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0203974 titled "Method And Wireless Device For Providing A Maintenance Notification For A Maintenance Activity" to Seibel ("Seibel") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,844,473 titled "Method And Apparatus For Remotely

Collecting Operational Information Of A Mobile Vehicle” to Kaman (“Kaman”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner stated:

Kempen et al. clearly discloses all the limitations except for the computer being a PDA; the communications is wireless; and the PDA wirelessly initiates at least a vehicle test program for a plurality of vehicles that manipulates at least one of the plurality of output devices. The manipulation of the input and output devices admitted in Kempen et al. reads on the test program.

However, the Examiner acknowledged that Kempen does not disclose “the computer being a PDA; the communications is wireless; and the PDA wirelessly initiates at least a vehicle test program for a plurality of vehicles that manipulates at least one of the plurality of output devices.” The Examiner then stated “Seibel teaches using a PDA in place of a computer or laptop.” The Examiner further stated “Kempen et al. and Seibel ... do not disclose the PDA can be connected to a fleet of vehicles; the PDA wirelessly initiates at least a vehicle test program for a plurality of vehicles that manipulates at least one of the plurality of output devices; and all the various report types. Kaman teaches connecting to a fleet of vehicle to generate reports.”

The Examiner concluded:

[T]he test program can be broadly interpreted as the request for maintenance information. All of the various maintenance and usage reports are a design choice within the ordinary skill of one in the art and provide no unexpected results.

Kempen relates to a “military vehicle” having a “cooperative control network with distributed I/O interfacing.” (Kempen at col. 1, lines 17-18). In a particular embodiment, Kempen relates “to a military vehicle having a control system that is capable of reconfiguring itself in response to a failure mode operation.” (Kempen at col. 1, lines 19-22).

Seibel relates to a “maintenance notification [system] for a maintenance activity associated with a vehicle.” (Seibel at col. 1, lines 9-10).

Kaman relates to a system to “correlate and collect maintenance information (e.g., indicia of usage) on a number of vehicles.” (Kaman at col. 2, lines 65-67).

Independent Claims 14, 15, 17, and 18 relate to “a system” and recite, in combination with other elements, a control system “wherein the personal digital assistant device wirelessly initiates at least a vehicle test program for” each vehicle (Claims 15 and 18) or a plurality of vehicles (Claims 14 and 17) and “that manipulates at least one of the plurality of output devices” and wherein “the personal digital assistant generates a report that compares the results of the vehicle test program manipulation for” each vehicle (Claims 15 and 18) or a plurality of vehicles (Claims 14 and 17). Claims 19-22 depend from independent Claim 14.

The “system ... wherein the personal digital assistant device wirelessly initiates at least a vehicle test program” recited in independent Claims 14, 15, 17, and 18 would not have been obvious in view of Kempen, alone or in any proper combination with Seibel and/or Kaman under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Kempen, alone or in any proper combination with Seibel and/or Kaman, does not disclose or teach a system, in combination with other elements, “wherein the personal digital assistant device wirelessly initiates at least a vehicle test program.”

Each reference has its own respective functionality that is independent of any need or motivation for combination with the functionality of the other. To transform “the military vehicle having cooperative control network with distributed I/O interfacing” of Kempen, the “method and wireless device for providing a maintenance notification for a maintenance activity” of Seibel, and the “method and apparatus for remotely collecting operational information of a mobile vehicle” of Kaman into a system wherein the personal digital assistant device wirelessly initiates at least a vehicle test program would require still further modification, and such modification is taught only by the Applicants’ own disclosure. The suggestion to make the

combination of Kempen with Seibel and/or Kaman has been taken from the Applicants' own specification using hindsight, which is improper.

The "system ... wherein the personal digital assistant device wirelessly initiates at least a vehicle test program" recited in independent Claims 14, 15, 17, and 18, considered as a whole, would not have been obvious in view of Kempen with Seibel and/or Kaman. The rejection of Claims 14, 15, 17, and 18 over Kempen with Seibel and/or Kaman under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper. Therefore, Claims 14, 15, 17, and 18 are patentable over Kempen with Seibel and/or Kaman.

Dependent Claims 19-22, which depend from independent Claim 14, are also patentable. See 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 14, 15, and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

2. Independent Claim 41

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 41 as being obvious over Kempen in view of Seibel; further in view of Kaman; and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0060246 titled "System, Method, And Computer Program For Monitoring Inventory" to Lastinger et al. ("Lastinger") under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner stated "Kempen et al., Seibel, and Kaman disclose the limitations set forth above." However, the Examiner acknowledged that "[t]hey do not disclose the PDA is configured to receive a radio frequency signal from the cargo stored in the storage compartment that includes characteristics of the cargo; and generating a report based on the characteristics of the cargo; and generating a report that incorporates the results of the vehicle test program with the characteristics of the cargo."

The Examiner concluded:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the invention of Lastinger et al. in the invention of Kempen et al., Seibel, and Kaman to perform more diagnostics.

Kempen relates to a “military vehicle” having a “cooperative control network with distributed I/O interfacing.” (Kempen at col. 1, lines 17-18). In a particular embodiment, Kempen relates “to a military vehicle having a control system that is capable of reconfiguring itself in response to a failure mode operation.” (Kempen at col. 1, lines 19-22).

Seibel relates to a “maintenance notification [system] for a maintenance activity associated with a vehicle.” (Seibel at col. 1, lines 9-10).

Kaman relates to a system to “correlate and collect maintenance information (e.g., indicia of usage) on a number of vehicles.” (Kaman at col. 2, lines 65-67).

Lastinger relates to method, system, and computer program for “monitoring inventory in an inventory control framework.” (Lastinger, abstract). Lastinger relates to “storage units in a vehicle” where the “information received from each storage unit may relate to the weight of the load supported by the respect storage unit [and/or] ... the location of the storage unit within the vehicle.” (Lastinger, para. [0008]).

Independent Claim 41 relate to “a system” and recite, in combination with other elements, a “portable handheld off-board computer” receiving signals from the control system and wherein “the portable handheld off-board computer generates a report that incorporates the results of the vehicle test program manipulation with the characteristic of the cargo.”

The “system” including “portable handheld off-board computer” which receives signals from the control system and wherein “the portable handheld off-board computer generates a report that incorporates the results of the vehicle test program manipulation with the characteristic of the cargo” recited in independent Claim 41 would not have been obvious in view

of Kempen, alone or in any proper combination with Seibel, Kaman, and/or Lastinger under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Kempen, alone or in any proper combination with Seibel, Kaman, and/or Lastinger, does not disclose or teach a system, in combination with other elements, “the portable handheld off-board computer generates a report that incorporates the results of the vehicle test program manipulation with the characteristic of the cargo.”

Each reference has its own respective functionality that is independent of any need or motivation for combination with the functionality of the other. To transform “the military vehicle having cooperative control network with distributed I/O interfacing” of Kempen, the “method and wireless device for providing a maintenance notification for a maintenance activity” of Seibel, the “method and apparatus for remotely collecting operational information of a mobile vehicle” of Kaman, and the “system, method, and computer program for monitoring inventory” of Lastinger into a system wherein the portable handheld off-board computer generates a report that incorporates the results of the vehicle test program manipulation with the characteristic of the cargo would require still further modification, and such modification is taught only by the Applicants’ own disclosure. The suggestion to make the combination of Kempen with Seibel, Kaman, and/or Lastinger has been taken from the Applicants’ own specification using hindsight, which is improper.

The “system” including “portable handheld off-board computer” which receives signals from the control system and wherein “the portable handheld off-board computer generates a report that incorporates the results of the vehicle test program manipulation with the characteristic of the cargo” recited in independent Claim 41, considered as a whole, would not have been obvious in view of Kempen with Seibel, Kaman, and/or Lastinger. The rejection of Claim 41 over Kempen with Seibel, Kaman, and/or Lastinger under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper. Therefore, Claim 41 is patentable over Kempen with Seibel, Kaman, and/or Lastinger.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

3. Independent Claims 37 and 42

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 37 and 42 as being obvious over Kempen in view of Seibel; in view of Kaman; in view of Lastinger; and in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0069850 titled “Truck Cargo Management RFID Tags And Interrogators” to DeWilde (“DeWilde”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner stated “DeWilde teach storing cargo destination information in the vehicle in paragraphs 9-10. However, the Examiner acknowledged that “[Kempen, Seibel, Kaman, and Lastinger] do not disclose receiving information regarding the destination of the cargo.” The Examiner concluded “[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of DeWilde with the previous invention because such modification would ensure prompt and accurate delivery of packages as disclosed by DeWilde.”

Kempen relates to a “military vehicle” having a “cooperative control network with distributed I/O interfacing.” (Kempen at col. 1, lines 17-18). In a particular embodiment, Kempen relates “to a military vehicle having a control system that is capable of reconfiguring itself in response to a failure mode operation.” (Kempen at col. 1, lines 19-22).

Seibel relates to a “maintenance notification [system] for a maintenance activity associated with a vehicle.” (Seibel at col. 1, lines 9-10).

Kaman relates to a system to “correlate and collect maintenance information (e.g., indicia of usage) on a number of vehicles.” (Kaman at col. 2, lines 65-67).

Lastinger relates to method, system, and computer program for “monitoring inventory in an inventory control framework.” (Lastinger, abstract). Lastinger relates to “storage units in a vehicle” where the “information received from each storage unit may relate to the weight of the load supported by the respect storage unit [and/or] ... the location of the storage unit within the vehicle.” (Lastinger, para. [0008]).

DeWilde disclosure appears to only teach an inventory management system for cargo delivery. (DeWilde at para. [0007]).

Independent Claim 37 relate to “a vehicle with a storage compartment, a control system and portable handheld off-board computer “wherein the portable handheld off-board computer wirelessly receives a radio frequency signal from the cargo stored in the storage compartment” and “wherein the portable handheld off-board computer wirelessly receives information regarding the destination of the cargo and at least some of the I/O status information from the control system.”

Independent Claim 42 relates to a vehicle with a storage compartment, a control system and portable handheld off-board computer “wherein the portable handheld off-board computer wirelessly receives a radio frequency signal from the cargo stored in the storage compartment, the radio frequency signal identifies a characteristic of the cargo” and “wherein the portable handheld off-board computer wirelessly receives at least some of the I/O status information from the control system” and “wherein the portable handheld off-board computer generates a report that incorporates information about cargo destination, weight, type, and location, the report further including a customized combination of select cargo and I/O status information selectable by a user, wherein the customized combination comprises a plurality of the following: delivery deadlines, transit time, source location, transit distance, fuel economy, fluid levels, tire pressure, and average engine RPM.”

The “system,” “wherein the portable handheld off-board computer wirelessly receives a radio frequency signal from the cargo stored in the storage compartment, the radio frequency signal identifies a characteristic of the cargo” and “wherein the portable handheld off-board computer wirelessly receives at least some of the I/O status information from the control system,” recited in independent Claims 37 and 42 would not have been obvious in view of Kempen, alone or in any proper combination with Seibel, Kaman, Lastinger, and/or DeWilde under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Kempen, alone or in any proper combination with Seibel, Kaman, Lastinger, and/or DeWilde, does not disclose or teach a system, in combination with other elements, “wherein the

portable handheld off-board computer wirelessly receives a radio frequency signal from the cargo stored in the storage compartment, the radio frequency signal identifies a characteristic of the cargo” and “wherein the portable handheld off-board computer wirelessly receives at least some of the I/O status information from the control system.”

Each reference has its own respective functionality that is independent of any need or motivation for combination with the functionality of the other. To transform “the military vehicle having cooperative control network with distributed I/O interfacing” of Kempen, the “method and wireless device for providing a maintenance notification for a maintenance activity” of Seibel, and the “method and apparatus for remotely collecting operational information of a mobile vehicle” of Kaman, the “system, method, and computer program for monitoring inventory” of Lastinger, and the “truck cargo management RFID tags and interrogators” of DeWilde into a system wherein the portable handheld off-board computer wirelessly receives a radio frequency signal from the cargo stored in the storage compartment, the radio frequency signal identifies a characteristic of the cargo and wherein the portable handheld off-board computer wirelessly receives at least some of the I/O status information from the control system would require still further modification, and such modification is taught only by the Applicants’ own disclosure. The suggestion to make the combination of Kempen with Seibel, Kaman, Lastinger, and/or DeWilde has been taken from the Applicants’ own specification using hindsight, which is improper.

The “system,” “wherein the portable handheld off-board computer wirelessly receives a radio frequency signal from the cargo stored in the storage compartment, the radio frequency signal identifies a characteristic of the cargo and wherein the portable handheld off-board computer wirelessly receives at least some of the I/O status information from the control system,” recited in independent Claims 37 and 42, considered as a whole, would not have been obvious in view of Kempen with Seibel, Kaman, Lastinger, and/or DeWilde. The rejection of Claims 37 and 42 over Kempen with Seibel, Kaman, Lastinger, and/or DeWilde under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper. Therefore, Claims 37 and 42 are patentable over Kempen with Seibel, Kaman, Lastinger, and/or DeWilde.

Dependent Claims 38-40, which depend from independent Claim 37, are also patentable. See 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 37-40 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

4. Dependent Claim 34

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 34 as being obvious over Kempen in view of Seibel; Kaman; and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,141,610 to Rothert et al. (“Rothert”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Dependent Claim 34 depends from independent Claim 14. Independent Claim 14 is related to “a system” and recite, in combination with other elements, a control system “wherein the personal digital assistant device wirelessly initiates at least a vehicle test program for” a plurality of vehicles and “that manipulates at least one of the plurality of output devices” and wherein “the personal digital assistant generates a report that compares the results of the vehicle test program manipulation for” a plurality of vehicles.

Rothert does not cure the deficiencies of Kempen, Seibel, and/or Kaman stated above regarding independent Claim 14. Therefore, dependent Claim 34, which depend from independent Claim 14, is also patentable. See 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

5. Independent Claims 1, 23, and 28

On pages 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 23, and 28 along with various dependent claims as being obvious over Kempen in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0181405 titled “System For Providing Remote Access To Diagnostic Information Over A Wide Area Network” to Ying (“Ying”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner stated:

Ying teaches using a PDA in place of a computer or laptop in figures 1 and 5 and paragraph 21; and a touch screen in paragraph 60.

However, the Examiner acknowledged that Kempen does not disclose “the computer being a PDA; the wireless communications is encrypted; the PDA has a touch screen; the wireless range is one mile or 1000 feet; the manipulation of the input and output devices admitted in Kempen et al. reads on the test program; and the location of the PDA while carrying out the tests is functional language that the admitted prior art is capable of.”

The Examiner concluded:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the PDA in place of the laptop because it is a design choice and provides the freedom of movement describes in Ying. The advantages and limitations of a PDA over a laptop or PC are readily evident in the art. Kempen et al. and Ying do not disclose the wireless range is one mile or 1000 feet. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a wireless range or one mile or 1000 feet because it is a design choice. The most common types of wireless communication with a PDA is 802.11 and depending on conditions can reach up to a mile. This could be argued to be inherent in Ying.

Kempen relates to a “military vehicle” having a “cooperative control network with distributed I/O interfacing.” (Kempen at col. 1, lines 17-18). In a particular embodiment, Kempen relates “to a military vehicle having a control system that is capable of reconfiguring itself in response to a failure mode operation.” (Kempen at col. 1, lines 19-22).

Ying relates to a system for “facilitating diagnosis and maintenance or one or more control networks located on a mobile conveyance comprises one or more wireless ground stations configured to communicate over a wireless communication channel with a control network via a wireless interface.” (Ying at paragraph [0020]).

Independent Claims 1, 23, and 28 relate to “a system” and recite, in combination with other elements, a control system “wherein the vehicle test program sequentially actuates the plurality of output devices.” Claims 2-4, 7-13, 25, 29-31, 33, 35, and 36 depend variously from independent Claims 1, 23, and 28.

The “system ... wherein the vehicle test program sequentially actuates the plurality of output devices,” recited in independent Claims 1, 23, and 28 would not have been obvious in view of Kempen, alone or in any proper combination with Ying under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Kempen, alone or in any proper combination with Ying, does not disclose or teach a system, in combination with other elements, “wherein the vehicle test program sequentially actuates the plurality of output devices.”

Each reference has its own respective functionality that is independent of any need or motivation for combination with the functionality of the other. To transform “the military vehicle having cooperative control network with distributed I/O interfacing” of Kempen and the “system for providing remote access to diagnostic information over a wide area network” of Ying into a system wherein the vehicle test program sequentially actuates the plurality of output devices would require still further modification, and such modification is taught only by the Applicants’ own disclosure. The suggestion to make the combination of Kempen with Ying has been taken from the Applicants’ own specification using hindsight, which is improper.

The “system ... wherein the vehicle test program sequentially actuates the plurality of output devices,” recited in independent Claims 1, 23, and 28, considered as a whole, would not have been obvious in view of Kempen with Ying. The rejection of Claims 1, 23, and 28 over Kempen with Ying under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper. Therefore, Claims 1, 23, and 28 are patentable over Kempen with Ying.

Dependent Claims 2-4, 7-13, 25, 29-31, 33, 35, and 36, which depend from independent Claims 1, 23, and 28, are also patentable. See 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-4, 7-13, 23, 25, 28-31, 33, 35, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

6. Dependent Claims 5, 6, and 26

On pages 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 5, 6, and 26 as being obvious over Kempen in view of Ying; and further in view of Kaman under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner stated:

Kaman teaches connecting to a fleet of vehicle to generate reports on lines 63-67, on column 2, and lines 1-5, on column 3.

However, the Examiner acknowledged that Kempen and Ying do not disclose “the PDA can be connected to a fleet of vehicles; and all the various report types.”

The Examiner concluded:

All of the various maintenance and usage reports are a design choice within the ordinary skill of one in the art and provide no unexpected results. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Kaman in the invention of Siebel and Kempen et al. because such modification would provide reliable monitoring of vehicle usage and a Kaman discloses on lines 10-14, on column 1, ‘the need to collect operational information on mobile vehicles is well known. Recommended vehicular maintenance procedures are typically tiled to vehicular usage. The more a vehicle is used the more frequently the vehicle must be serviced.’

Kempen relates to a “military vehicle” having a “cooperative control network with distributed I/O interfacing.” (Kempen at col. 1, lines 17-18). In a particular embodiment, Kempen relates “to a military vehicle having a control system that is capable of reconfiguring itself in response to a failure mode operation.” (Kempen at col. 1, lines 19-22).

Ying relates to a system for “facilitating diagnosis and maintenance or one or more control networks located on a mobile conveyance comprises one or more wireless ground stations configured to communicate over a wireless communication channel with a control network via a wireless interface.” (Ying at paragraph [0020]).

Kaman relates to a system to “correlate and collect maintenance information (e.g., indicia of usage) on a number of vehicles.” (Kaman at col. 2, lines 65-67).

Dependent Claims 5, 6, and 26 depend from independent Claims 1 and 23. Independent Claims 1 and 23 related to “a system” and recite, in combination with other elements, a control system “wherein the vehicle test program sequentially actuates the plurality of output devices.”

Kaman does not cure the deficiencies of Kempen and/or Ying stated above regarding independent Claims 1 and 23. Therefore, dependent Claims 5, 6, and 26, which depend variously from independents Claims 1 and 23, are also patentable. See 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 5, 6, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

7. Dependent Claims 32 and 34

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 32 and 34 as being obvious over Kempen in view of Ying; and further in view of Rothert under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Dependent Claim 32 depends from independent Claim 1. Independent Claim 1 is related to “a system” and recite, in combination with other elements, a control system “wherein the vehicle test program sequentially actuates the plurality of output devices wherein the vehicle test program sequentially actuates the plurality of output devices.”

Dependent Claim 34 depends from independent Claim 14. Independent Claim 14 is related to “a system” and recite, in combination with other elements, a control system “wherein the personal digital assistant device wirelessly initiates at least a vehicle test program for” a

plurality of vehicles and “that manipulates at least one of the plurality of output devices” and wherein “the personal digital assistant generates a report that compares the results of the vehicle test program manipulation for” a plurality of vehicles.

Rothert does not cure the deficiencies of Kempen, and/or Ying stated above regarding independent Claims 1 and 14. Therefore, dependent Claims 32 and 34, which depend from independent Claims 1 and 14, are also patentable. See 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 32 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

* * *

Applicants believe that the present Application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the Application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present Application.

Further, Applicants respectfully put the Patent Office and all others on notice that all arguments, representations, and/or amendments contained herein are only applicable to the present Application and should not be considered when evaluating any other patent or patent application including any patents or patent applications which claim priority to this patent Application and/or any patents or patent applications to which priority is claimed by this patent Application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid

amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 4-14-08

By /David G. Luetngen/

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5769
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

David G. Luetngen
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,282